



## Case Western Reserve Law Review

---

Volume 22 | Issue 3

---

1971

# Editor's Preface

Richard E. Hahn

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/caselrev>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Richard E. Hahn, *Editor's Preface*, 22 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 377 (1971)

Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/caselrev/vol22/iss3/3>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Journals at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Case Western Reserve Law Review by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

## EDITORS' PREFACE

The articles in the third issue of Volume 22 focus upon several legal problems relating to colleges and universities.

Mr. Lawrence R. Caruso discusses the student's right of privacy in the context of the university's collection and disclosure of information about the student. Mr. Caruso also considers the possibility that the university may be bound by a duty of confidentiality, barring the release of personal information from the student's files.

In the second article, Professor William M. Beaney and Mr. Jonathan Cox suggest that court-defined standards for disciplinary proceedings do not serve the best interests of the student and the university, and these standards may not insure optimal fairness. As an alternative to reliance on court decisions, the authors propose that universities reorient their approach to student disciplinary proceedings and adopt rules which will guarantee fairness without creating an adversarial atmosphere.

Messrs. Bruce R. Hopkins and John H. Myers review the response by the federal and state governments to the current spread of campus unrest. The authors conclude that these vindictive attempts to curb campus unrest have been misdirected toward the symptoms, rather than the causes, of campus disruptions. Messrs. Hopkins and Myers believe that the universities themselves must be the primary element in any effective solution to this problem.

In the final article, Mr. Harry W. Pettigrew turns to the risks accompanying a nontenured teacher's exercise of academic freedom. Surveying the applicable case law, Mr. Pettigrew concludes that certain protections, which he refers to as "constitutional tenure," are available to the nontenured faculty member.

In his Comment, Professor Paul G. Haskell proposes a new and interesting approach to legal education. He suggests that the total number of years and dollars expended for law school could be reduced through an adjustment in the law school calendar. Professor Haskell also responds to current criticism of legal education with regard to its lack of interdisciplinary studies, inadequate clinical training, irrelevance to societal needs, and traditional methodology.

